



## **AGC/WSDOT ROADWAY TEAM**

### **Draft Meeting Minutes: April 17, 2008 Meeting**

#### **Attending:**

X	Frank Scarsella		Mike Bradley	X	Bill Grady
	Scott Stephens		Bob Glenn	X	Dan Glover
X	James Prouty		Dan Howell		
X	Jim Spaid	X	Derek Case		Mike Morishige
X	Gil McNabb		Ken Stone	X	Bob Romine
X	Paul Bennett	X	Casey Liles		Kurt Williams

#### **Introductions**

#### **Minutes of April 17, 2008 meeting:**

#### **Minutes of other Team Meetings:**

The meeting notes from the last AGC Roadway Team meeting held on March 6, 2008 were passed out and briefly reviewed. There were no comments or corrections.

The minutes of the March 14, 2008 Administration Team meeting were passed out. Comments were solicited on the team members experience with electronic bidding. Bill Grady noted that it would be important that all bidders have the appropriate software in order to bid. A known and consistent bid time clock was also recognized as important (as discussed in the admin minutes).

Bill Grady requested that the Roadway Team be given the opportunity to comment on any possible changes to the weighing procedures specification before it is released. Jim agreed to bring it to the team at that time.

The growing importance of accommodating pedestrians in work zones and the larger issue of ADA compliance was discussed. Paul Bennett shared that the State Design Engineers office is working to establish consistent guidance to the agency regarding such things as ramp slopes, cross walk grades, etc.

A brief discussion of the upcoming health hazards GSP followed.

The minutes of the March 21, 2008 Structures Team meeting were passed out. There were no comments.

## **Old Business**

### **Section 8-22 Pavement Marking**

Another copy of the draft amendment to Standard Specification 8-22 was handed out to the group. Dan Glover indicated that he had previously forwarded a copy of this same spec to Stripe Rite, Apply A Line and Road Runner. One had responded that they had no objections to the new spec and the others had not responded. There were no other comments from the group.

### **Section 8-23 Temporary Pavement markings**

Another copy of the draft amendment to Standard Specification 8-23 was handed out to the group. Jim Prouty expressed concern that the use of temporary raised pavement markers could result in pavement damage or ghosting following their removal. A discussion of region practices to avoid this issue followed. Both SW and NW regions had used longitudinally offset permanent skip stripes to avoid conflict with existing temp paint skip stripes.

Gil McNabb noted that 3M temp tape had been used with long term success on SR 202.

### **Section 8-22 Plural Component Pavement Marking**

A copy of a draft GSP for plural component pavement marking was handed out. Jim noted that another version would be coming soon due to some last minute edits. Jim Prouty volunteered to send the updated version to the striping subcontractors when he receives it from Jim. It was also agreed that they should be invited to the meeting for discussion and comment.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

### **Section 2-02.3(4) Removal of Anchor Bolts**

Jim handed out a draft amendment for the removal of anchor bolts. It supplements the existing specification for removal of structures and obstructions to allow the burn off and grout back of anchor bolts that can remain in existing concrete. There were no comments.

### **Section 2-02.3 Removal of Hazardous Material**

A draft revision to the Removal of Hazardous Material specification was passed out. Bill Grady noted that there was not mention of the contractor preparing and submitting a plan for the removal nor for the measurement and payment for said plan. He also suggested that the proscriptive language regarding the handling of material also include an option “or in accordance with the approved plan”.

## **Bollards**

A revision to the GSP for bollards was handed out. There were no comments.

## **General Discussion**

Several members of the team noted they were seeing projects on advertisement that included lump sum traffic control for multi season, complex projects. A lively discussion ensued about the subject. Bill Grady noted it was not in the best interest of either party to competitively bid safety. Dan Glover noted an experience where a local agency had adopted the use of lump sum traffic control simply because WSDOT had used it in the past. Unfortunately, the project complexity did not lend itself well to the use of the item. Dan suggested that WSDOT be willing to change its contracts when the bidders all agree that it is inappropriate for the given job. Dan agreed that there had been several, straightforward projects where lump sum traffic control worked fine. But it was not appropriate for complex projects with multiple varying traffic control setups, large urban intersections, multiple seasons, etc. Bill and Frank agreed that it was not appropriate for multi season grading jobs, either. Derek explained that lump sum traffic control was intended to prevent cost overruns associated with inefficient scheduling of work. Prime contractors usually get in and get done efficiently, but the little clean up details, typically performed by a variety of subcontractors, can consume a lot of working days and drive up traffic control costs. Jim said he would bring the concerns to the Contract Administration group for discussion.

## **Other Business**

No further comments from around the table.

**Next Meeting Date: May 22, 2008**